Vol. XIV, No. 2 S.F.T.S JUNE, 1955

LIBRARY

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CONTENTS

Page

"FAITHFULNESS" AND "FAITH" 33
By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, South Australia.

AN ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND I COR. 7 41
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.

WORSHIP IN THE REFORMED CHURCH 51
By the Rev. D. B. Knox. B.A., M.Th., D.Phil., Moore College, Sydney.

BOOK REVIEWS 55
(See list on inside of back cover.)

PRICE: TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.
THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.
THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.
THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Sydney.
THE REV. ALLAN MacKILLOP, B.A., B.D., Brisbane.
THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.
THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, Melbourne, E.2. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:
Seven Shillings and Sixpence (Foreign, 8/-), post free.

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XIV, No. 2 JUNE, 1955

"Faithfulness" and "Faith"

This paper deals with a point which I have never seen discussed systematically; whether the word "faith," as St. Paul uses it, carries a Hebrew rather than a Greek meaning. Thus in Rom. 3:22 and several similar passages, we get the phrase *dia pisteos Iesou Christou,* where R.V. and most commentators assume that *pistis* means what it means in our European languages, and translate "through faith in Jesus Christ"; this is intelligible enough, but it does not explain why in the immediately following words he repeats himself and says "unto all them that believe." A.V. translates "through faith of Jesus Christ," which is barely intelligible as it stands; but it would become clear at once if for the Greek *pistis* we were to read the Hebrew word *'emunah,* which in the O.T. is repeatedly used to mean "the Faithfulness of God." The phrase will then mean "the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ," God's Faithfulness revealed in Him.

The discussion of the word "faith" raises for us to-day the whole problem of Christian faith in face of the prevalent scientific and secular humanism; this is a very living issue, and it is urgently necessary for the Biblical theologian to relate his studies to it, and not live in a world apart. This needs to be said by way of apology for a paper such as this, which is concerned solely with Biblical exegesis: to show how St. Paul uses the word *pistis* on the basis of the new relation to God into which we have come through God's saving action in Christ. But it is necessary for us to get our exegesis right, and to know the Gospel that is committed to us.

(1) The Greek word *pistis* is defined by Liddell and Scott as denoting trust or confidence in persons and things; faithfulness and honesty in persons; pledges given as assurances of good faith; and *pisteuein,* as denoting the putting of trust in a person or thing; believing that a statement is true; entrusting something to someone. Thus,

in the ordinary epistemological use, we speak of certain knowledge that a thing is so; faith or belief, on good authority, that it is so; and opinion, when it is thought to be so, on less sure grounds. As Dr. Dodd says, "It would be true to say, by and large, that in Greek literature the intellectual element is the controlling one. *Pistis* in the gods is primarily belief that they exist, or belief in the veracity of their communications to men."(1) It was used in a religious sense by Socrates, and in the Hermetic literature it had a special connection with the idea of revelation. But we do not get here anything like the Pauline and Johannine use of *pisteuein eis* of faith in God and in Christ (ibidem, p. 183).

Always in Christian usage it has been clear that "faith" means more than intellectual assent. With the scholastics, the formula for "justifying faith" is *fides caritate formata* (St. Thomas Aquinas, S.T. IIa-IIae, iv, 3), cf Gal. 5:6, "faith working through love." On the Protestant side, there has always been a special concern to insist that faith involves above all a personal response of trust rather than a merely intellectual belief. But it remains that in all our European languages, "faith" is seen as an act or activity of man.

(2) It is just at this point that the Hebrew meaning is sharply different; the verb *'aman* in its various forms, and *'emunah* and the other derivative nouns, have the fundamental meaning of "firmness," "steadfastness," "sureness"; and this applies above all to God, so that *'emunah*, faithfulness, becomes a Divine attribute:

"Thy loving-kindness, O LORD, is in the heavens;
Thy faithfulness reacheth unto the skies;
Thy righteousness is like the mountains of God;
Thy judgments are a great deep.
O LORD, Thou preservest man and beast.
How precious is Thy loving-kindness, O God,
And the children of men take refuge under the shadow of Thy wings" (Ps. 36:5-7).

As the psalmist implies, the Hebrew word denoting steadfastness and firmness applies properly to God and not to man, who is repeatedly characterized as physically frail ("All flesh is grass . . . the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand for ever," Isa. 40:6-8) and as morally unstable (as in the first four verses of Ps. 36, where ungodly man "flatters himself in his own eyes" and his words are "iniquity and deceit").

(1) C. H. Dodd, **The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 179.**

Hence the words "faith" and "to believe" *(he'emin)* do not properly describe a virtue or quality of man, in the sense that virtues such as prudence or courage are ascribed to him; they describe man taking refuge from his own frailty and instability in God who is firm and steadfast. So in Isa. 7:9, the prophet says to the weak and timid king Ahaz, who is scared of the kings of Syria and northern Israel, "If ye will not believe, ye shall not be established"—if you will not make-yourselves-firm (on God), you will not be made-firm. Similarly Isa. 28:16, which Dodd translates (*op. cit.* p. 183), "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious stone of sure foundation; he who has constancy will not hurry distractedly to and fro." And Habbakuk 2:4, "The just shall live in his faithfulness," where the contrast is between the insolent self-assertion and boastfulness of the Chaldeans, which has been described at length in the previous chapter, and the steadfastness of the faithful Israelites who stand firm in their trust in God. The LXX reading is, however, "The just shall live by My faithfulness," *ek pisteos mou.*

(3) We come now to St. Paul. At once we find the Hebrew *'emunah* reappearing in Rom. 3:3: "Shall their want of faith *(apistia)* make ineffective the Faithfulness *(pistis)* of God?"; on this rendering the commentators are agreed. Previously, in 1:17, he has quoted Habb. 2:4, though not, according to the best MSS, in the LXX form, but simply *ek pisteos.* But he has just said, "In it (the Gospel) the Righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith" *(ek pisteos eis pistin)*: what does this mean? The commentators mostly render the words "from faith to faith" as referring to the testimony to the Gospel given by one believing man to another (but St. Paul is referring to God's own action in revealing His Righteousness, not to man's testimony to it), or else as denoting degrees of human faith, a weaker faith leading on to a stronger faith. But is not the sentence much simpler and clearer if we can take it that he meant "from God's faithfulness to man's faith" whereby he is made-firm on God's steadfast firmness?

Similarly, St. Paul uses the word *pistos* of God: God is faithful, who, having "called" the Corinthians, will "confirm" them to the end, I Cor. 1:8-9; who will not suffer them to be tempted beyond their power (I Cor. 10:13); "He who calls you is faithful, who will also do it" (I Thess. 5:24). In the same way he speaks of our Lord: "Faithful is the Lord, who will stablish you and keep you from the Evil One" (II Thess. 3:3). Outside St. Paul,

pistos is used of Christ in Heb. 2:17, 3:2, I John 1:9, and very notably in the Apocalypse: He is "the faithful Witness" (Rev. 1:5), "the Faithful and True" (19:11); and in 3:14 the connection of these words with *'aman* is made clear: "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God."

The Hebrew *'aman* shows through very clearly in II Cor. 1:18-20: "As God is faithful, our word towards you is not first Yes and then No"; for the Son of God, Jesus Christ is not Yes and No, but in Him is the Yes; for all the Promises of God are fulfilled in Him, who is the Yes, "wherefore also through Him is the Amen, to the glory of God through us. Now He who stablishes us (*ho bebaion*, He who makes us firm) with you, and who anointed us, is God." Gregory Dix gives us the right phrase for this passage: "Jesus, the Amen to the everlasting Yea of God."(2) Thus in Christ God's Faithfulness is manifested, as in Him is manifested the Righteousness of God, which in the O.T. is regularly linked with His activity in Salvation, and God's *charis* or saving Mercy, and God's Love.

(4) It is true, of course, that St. Paul very frequently uses *pistis* of human faith, and the verb *pisteuein* must always bear this meaning; thus he speaks of "the faith of Abraham" (Rom. 4:14, 16), and of "your faith" (I Cor. 15:14, 17, II Cor. 1:24), etc. But since he had the one word *pistis* for the two things, Divine Faithfulness and human faith, which to our minds are clearly distinct, it is in some cases quite hard to decide which of the two is chiefly in his mind. Which is it in Phil. 1:27: "with one soul striving together for the faith of the Gospel"? is it "for the sureness, the truth, of the Gospel," or "in belief in the Gospel"? And in II Thess. 2:13: "God chose you for salvation in sanctification of the Spirit (*or*, of spirit) and faith of truth": is it "in the sureness of the truth" or "by believing in the truth"? Perhaps both meanings would be present to his mind. But there is a series of passages where we get a far better sense if we render *pistis* as the Faithfulness of God manifested in Christ, which we have seen already to be an authentic element in St. Paul's thought.

---

(2) In **The Shape of the Liturgy**, p 130, where he is expounding the liturgical Amen, common to Jews and Christians. In the LXX it is nearly always translated **genoito**, "So be it," because the O.T. is looking forward to God's future Day of Grace. But for the Christian it is a mighty affimation that in Christ God's promises are fulfilled, His Purpose is accomplished, and things prayed for according to His will are granted.—Hence we may say that it means much what Americans mean when they say "Sure!"; and we may recall the frequent "Amen I say unto you" of our Lord in the gospels.

Rom. 3:21-25. Let me translate with comments. 21, "But now, apart from the Law, God's Righteousness (and Salvation) has been manifested (in the person of Jesus Christ), witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets, 22 God's Righteousness, through the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, to all who believe"; (and now comes immediately the contrast with the frailty and instability of men) "for there is no distinction (between Jew and Gentile), for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (man was created to glorify God, and falls short of that Glory by sinning); 24 "being justified freely by His saving Mercy through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus" (made right with God, acquitted, liberated by the deliverance accomplished in the New Exodus), 25 "whom God set forth to be the Mercy-seat (the place of His atoning mercy), through Divine Faithfulness, in His Blood" (His sacrifice for sin); "to show His Righteousness," in that the sins of the past are not passed over, but are borne and atoned for, 26 that God might be shown to be "Righteous, and the Justifier of him who is of faith of Jesus." In this passage *pistis* occurs three times. To the last of these, in vs. 26, we will return later. In vs. 25, "through (our) faith in His blood" is an impossible rendering of the Greek, and it would introduce a reference to human faith in the middle of a set of three terms, the Mercy-seat, God's Faithfulness, Christ's sacrifice. In vs. 22, the phrase "to all who believe" would be redundant if *pistis* meant human faith. This same consideration applies in the two following passages.

Gal. 3:22: "That the Promise through Faithfulness of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." We have noted already in commenting on II Cor. 1:19-22 the connection of *'aman* with the fulfilment of the Promises.

Phil. 3:9: "Not having a righteousness of my own, but that which is through the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, the Righteousness which is from God *epi te pistei,* for (human) faith."

Eph. 3:12, "through the faith of Him " A.V.; "through our faith in Him," R.V. But "Faithfulness" plainly gives the better sense.

Col. 2:12, "in whom ye were raised to life through the Faithfulness of the working of God who raised Him from the dead." No need to bring in a reference to man's response into a phrase which describes the Divine saving action.

Gal. 2:16: "We, knowing that a man is not justified by works of the Law, but through the Faithfulness of

Christ Jesus *(dia pisteos Christou Iesou),* we too believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by the Faithfulness of Christ *(ek pisteos Christou),* and not by works of the Law"; and vs. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ; but I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in the Faithfulness of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." If we are right, the words *en pistei te tou Huiou tou Theou* are simply a variant of *en Christo,* the familiar "in Christ." In vs. 16, however, we have also had another phrase, *ek pisteos Christou;* and we cannot settle its meaning without considering the phrase which occurs several times, as a description of Christians: *hoi ek pisteos.* Why does he say "they that are of faith," or in Rom. 3:26 "him who is of faith of Jesus"? Why does he not say simply "those who believe," as in Acts 2:44?

(5) The point surely is that "they that are of faith" is a phrase corresponding to "they of the circumcision" and "they that are of the Law" (Rom. 4:14) or "they that are of the works of the Law" (Gal. 3:10); all these three phrases describe St. Paul's Jewish adversaries, with the exception that "they of the circumcision" can also be used for Jewish-Christians,[3] since *peritome* denotes Jews as such.[4] Without the article, *ek pisteos* (with a reminiscence of Habbakuk 2:4) and *ex ergon nomou* occur often in Galatians and Romans as the rival grounds of justification.

More than once in Romans (notably in ch. 2 and 3:1-6) we catch echoes of his many controversies with Jews in synagogues; and the way in which he uses these words seems to imply that they stood in his mind as slogans or catch-words—"circumcision" as standing for the Jewish claim to acceptance by God on the ground of being His chosen people, and "works of the Law" on the ground of

---

(3) Romans 3:30, Col. 4:11; Acts 10:45, 11:2. Romans 3:30 is unintelligible as usually translated: "who shall justify the circumcision by (ek) faith and the uncircumcision through (dia) faith." Truly a distinction without a difference! But surely, if **hoi ek pisteos** means "Christians" and **peritome** means "Jews," the **peritome ek pisteos** is the Jewish Christians. What he is saying is that they and the Gentile Christians are justified equally through faith.

(4). So in Gal. 2:12, where "Peter drew back and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision," the cause of his fear was the unbelieving Jews at Jerusalem. The messengers from James had brought word that the rumours of Jewish Christians at Antioch fraternizing with Gentiles were putting the Palestinian Christians in danger from that quarter. Hence Peter and the others planned a "purely temporary" separation of Jews and Gentiles in Antioch at their Agape and Eucharist, till the trouble should blow over, without intending any sort of change of principle; this expedient would further avoid any demand for the circumcision of the Gentiles. St. Paul called this "hypocrisy," or double-dealing; he would not have so described a surrender of principle; and his remonstrance with St. Peter, Gal. 2:14 ff, was an appeal to the principle that was common ground to them both. This is the brilliant exegesis of Gregory Dix in **Jew and Greek**, pp. 42-4, and it is of value in view of contemporary tendencies towards a partial revival of the error of F. C. Baur.

their fulfilment of their legal duty; and on St. Paul's side "faith," the Christians being *hoi ek pisteos*. What did he mean by this phrase? Was he putting up, in opposition to the Jewish claim, simply a personal attitude of "believing"? If this were all, he would have a singularly weak case, and one that would be open to all the criticisms of James 2:14-26. Actually, what St. Paul puts up to the Galatians is the Cross of Christ (Gal. 1:4, 2:20, 3:1, 13, 6:14), and the gift of the Spirit (3:3, 5, 4:6, 5:16-25); the messianic Promises have been fulfilled, the Christ has come; how then can they go back to the pre-messianic stage which has been left behind? In Romans, he grapples with the whole many-sided problem of man's Salvation. He shows how Man is under sin, most of all when he seeks to save himself by meritorious observance of God's Law; but now, in the eschatological events of Christ's coming, God's Righteousness has been manifested, first as His Wrath against man's sin, and then as Salvation. Christ has come to save, by uniting man to Himself the Second Adam, and by suffering death for man's sin. Therefore, as Christ died, so man must die; the self-centred ego of the Old Adam in us all must be crucified with Him and done to death; and as Christ rose from the dead, so man through baptism receives a share in His resurrection-life and the gift of the Spirit, whereby he is liberated from the selfish self and begins even now to live the new life which will be made complete at Christ's last Advent and in His eternal Kingdom.

Here is the work of God's Righteousness, His Faithfulness, His Grace, His Love; and it is all this that he opposes to the Jewish claim to justification by "circumcision" or by "works"; it is all this that is summed up in his phrase *ek pisteos*. The *pistis* is primarily not man's act of "believing," but God's *'emunah;* and when man on his part "believes," what happens is that his frailty and instability are "made firm" on the solid ground of God's saving action. That is the Biblical meaning of "faith" regarded as an act or activity of man.

(6) We have been concerned in this paper with the Biblical meaning of faith, and the recurrence of that meaning in St. Paul; and it does not fall within our subject to deal at length with his use of *pistis* as an act or activity of man, and of the verb *pisteuein*. A brief summary will suffice.

The pagan Greek meaning of faith was, as Dr. Dodd told us, predominantly intellectual, concerned with "believing that" (e.g., that the gods exist) and not with

"believing in" or "on," as the Christian believes in God. This phrase "to believe in" expresses the Biblical meaning of faith, as in Gal. 2:16, quoted above, or Rom. 10:14. But St. Paul has also the intellectual aspect; for we cannot believe *in* Christ unless we know about Him: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard" (Rom. 10:14); and in Rom. 10:9 the confession of faith is linked with believing "*that* God raised Him from the dead." This use of the word raises no difficulty. It comes again in a number of interesting phrases, such as "the obedience of faith" (Rom. 1:5), "the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10), "faith, hope and love" (I Cor. 13:13), "faith" contrasted with "sight" (II Cor. 5:7), "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5). In Gal. 5:22 "faith" comes as the seventh in a list of ten virtues which together make up "the fruit of the Spirit" (here it seems to carry the O.T. meaning of "steadfastness"); and in I Cor. 12:9 it is one of several gifts of the Spirit, being further defined in the next chapter (13:2) as "faith such as to move mountains," with a reminiscence of our Lord's saying in Mk. 11:23, Matt. 17:20. Such faith is there declared to be wholly worthless when treated as a human virtue, without the self-forgetfulness of love.

We may conclude with some words of Dr. G. W. H. Lampe, from his paper in *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Mowbray, 1954, p. 62):

"Faith is not a meritorious qualification for that Justification which is given 'freely by His grace.' Faith is the *leptikon organon*, the divinely-given instrument by which man is enabled to apprehend the personal grace of God in Christ. Faith is not a human work. . . . In fact, however, the misunderstanding which sets faith itself in the category of meritorious works has bedevilled the history of theology to an extraordinary degree. It lies behind Bull's insistence that Justification is by a combination of faith with obedience, charity, and other virtues. It is the reason for William Law's contention: 'Suppose one man to rely on his own faith and another to rely on his own works, then the faith of the one and the works of the other are equally the same worthless filthy rags'."

GABRIEL HERBERT, S.S.M.

St. Michael's House,
Crafers, South Australia.

An Attempt to Understand I Cor. 7

I Cor. 7 is full of exegetical puzzles. The following discourse tries to shed new light on the interpretation of this chapter. It proceeds on the assumption that Paul rigidly distinguishes between *charisma* (spiritual gift) and *agape* (Christian ethics), and it seeks in this distinction the clue to the understanding of I Cor. 7.

To my mind, Paul leaves no doubt that the *charismata* are "gifts" in the strict sense. They can only be "earnestly desired" (He always uses the term *zeeloun* in conjunction with the *charismata*: I Cor. 12:31, 14:1, 14:39), but they cannot be pursued as an ethical goal. In contrast to this, *agape* (as the sum of Christian ethics) falls under the imperative. It is meaningful for Paul to command the pursuit of *agape*, but not so, to command prophesying and the speaking of tongues. Paul consequently does not extend the use of such ethical terms as *diookein* (I Cor. 14:1; Rm. 12:13, 14:19; I Th. 5:15; Phl. 3:12, 14) and *karpos* (Gl. 5:22; Rm. 6:22) to the *charismata*, but confines it to *agape*. The *charisma* is a "gift" of the Spirit, *agape* is a fruit of the Spirit. This distinction is fundamental. In other words, both *charismata* and *agape* are manifestations of the same Spirit, but the manner in which the power of the coming kingdom operates, differs in each case. In a *charisma* the power of the Spirit establishes a fact in the manner of an indicative, in *agape* it does so through the medium of an imperative in response to which the "fruit" of the Spirit is released.

This distinction between *charisma* and *agape* offers a clue to the interpretation of I Cor. 7, because in v. 7 celibacy or the gift of continence is defined as a *charisma* (the context of vs. 1-7 shows this clearly; the fact that celibacy is not listed among the *charismata* in I Cor. 12 and Rm. 12 does not invalidate this interpretation since in both cases the selection is determined by the context and the lists are obviously not intended to be exhaustive). Once these two things are put together, it becomes clear that Paul's main concern in this chapter is to prevent both a wrong view of the nature of a *charisma* and an exaggerated view of its importance in the life of the Church. Paul wishes to press home two points: first, a *charisma* must not be mistaken for an ethical goal, and secondly, it must not interfere with the harmony of human relationships in the Church. The *charismata* have a community splitting tendency; they tend to create a pneumatic elite which cares more for the spiritual enjoyment of its own gifts than

for the edification of the Church. The conclusions which Paul puts forward in criticism of the Corinthian gnostics are directly applicable to the subject matter dealt with in I Cor. 7.

In the traditional exegesis of vs. 1-7 Paul appears as an advocate of celibacy who views marriage as a necessary evil and who will allow it as a concession only. Nothing could be further from the truth than this interpretation. It is a mistake to read v. 2 as if Paul meant to define marriage as a mere prophylactic of immorality, and the context is ignored when the "concession" in v. 6 is identified with the permission to marry. The position is rather as follows. Paul replies to a number of questions which the Corinthians had put to him (Our exegetical task would certainly be easier if we knew the precise nature of these questions; as it is, we have to infer it from the apostle's answers, a procedure which has its obvious difficulties). The first question of the Corinthians apparently dealt with the married state in general. It appears that some Christians in Corinth had come to question the lawfulness of the married state. It is possible that they were charismatically endowed Christians who believed that marriage was hostile to the charismatic state. These Christians Paul assures of the lawfulness of the married state, and, in addition, he warns them of ascetic experiments within the marriage bond. Since they obviously have not the *charisma* of celibacy they must not embark on anything that may surpass their strength. Such ascetic exercises may easily take a disastrous end and only play into Satan's hands. Only as a concession will he permit the interruption of physical intercourse, and that only for a definite period mutually agreed upon by the two partners (v. 5). Temporal abstinence from married relations is what Paul concedes to his readers; marriage itself is not a matter of concession with him. This false impression will only be created if one ignores that vs. 8, 9 deal with a different question from vs. 1-7 or if one puts a dualistic interpretation on vs. 1, 2 which the whole context of vs. 1-7 fails to confirm. In addition, Paul's use of *kalon . . . de* in vs. 1, 2 must be fully appreciated (the same sequence occurs elsewhere). The phrase, in Paul's usage, does not express full agreement, but only partial agreement in the sense of "I agree . . ., but . . ." In the present case, Paul agrees with the inquirers, it is good for a man not touch a woman (most likely a quotation from the letter addressed to Paul by the Corinthians), but there is the hard fact that a man who does not enjoy the *charisma* of celibacy has only one

alternative to marriage, and that is *porneia* (promiscuous intercourse with harlots). That alternative is, however, ruled out for reasons which the apostle gives in c. 6:12-20. This does not mean that Paul saw in marriage nothing but a prophylaxis of immorality. Paul rather wishes to impress on his readers that for a Christian who has not the *charisma* of celibacy, the alternative is not that of marriage or continence but that of marriage or incontinence *(porneia)*. Such a Christian is under a dangerous illusion if he thinks he can pursue as an ethical goal what is by its very nature a *charisma*, a "gift" in the strict sense of the word.

After Paul has stated his views on matrimony in general (vs. 1-7), he turns in vs. 8, 9 to a more specific question. As has already been pointed out, these verses introduce a new subject. If this fact is ignored, the meaning not only of vs. 1-7 but the whole chapter becomes obscure. Verses 8, 9 are not without their difficulties; one thing, however, is clear: Paul is dealing here with a different class of people from those in vs. 1-7, for in this case marriage is after all introduced as a concession. The people referred to in vs. 8, 9 have this in common with the preceding class that they have not the *charisma* of celibacy; otherwise there would be no need to make the concession of marriage. On the other hand, Paul thinks it at least possible for them to remain unmarried without visualising at once the danger of *porneia* as in the previous case. Who then are the members of this second class? The Greek text gives us the two terms *agamoi* and *cheerai*. Contrary to the general procedure adopted by commentators of this passage, we shall fasten on the term *cheerai* as the point of departure in identifying this class. It is made up for certain of "widows." There is no reason to be puzzled with J. Weiss about their presence here nor to cancel the words with Holsten nor to emendate the text with Bois reading *kai tois cheerois*. The real question is, what does *agamoi* stand for? The term refers usually to bachelors; once the presence of the "widows" in this class is admitted, the parallelism would suggest the meaning of "widower." This is, in fact, the only acceptable meaning of the term *agamoi* in this context. If Paul were to refer to bachelors in vs. 8, 9 he would actually contradict the principle that he has laid down in vs. 1-7: that every man should have his own wife (There is no reason to confine this ruling to already married couples only). Now, Paul uses *agamos* four times in this chapter (vs. 8, 11, 32 and 34), and in each case it takes on a different meaning determined by the context in which

it appears. In v. 11 *agamos* is used of a woman who has been married but who has left her husband, and in vs. 32, 34 it refers to young people of both sexes who are as yet unmarried. Paul obviously does not use the term in any rigidly defined sense; that sense has to be gathered from the context. In v.8 the context suggests as the most probable meaning for *agamoi* "widowers" to the exclusion of any other class of unmarried men. In that case, we should not say that Paul introduces here after all the notion of marriage as a concession; the concession consists rather in remarriage. This is not the same thing. Paul thought it apparently possible for widowed Christians to continue in the unmarried state, but even in their case he has no intention to enforce ascetic ideals. That Paul sees certain advantages in the unmarried state must not be denied, but this is not due to any dualistic hostility towards the physical life; it is rather an expression of that eschatological outlook (v. 29) which also inspired Jesus' words to the women of Jerusalen (Lk. 23:28, 29). Once more the phrase *kalon . . . de* offers only a partial agreement to an otherwise commendable principle. Admittedly though widowed Christians have a better chance of remaining continent in an unmarried state, Paul does not lose sight of the fact that the gift of continence is essentially a *charisma*.

In vs. 10, 11 Paul takes up still another question. It is generally believed that this passage deals with the subject of divorce. The explicit reference to a word of our Lord seems to confirm this view, since Paul most likely will have thought of the words which have been handed on in Mk. 10, 11, 12 (Mt. 19:9, 5:32) and Lk. 16:18). The parenthesis in v. 11 ("But if she does separate from her husband, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband"), however, makes it very unlikely that Paul is actually dealing here with the question of divorce. On this assumption he would appear to take a surprisingly lax view of divorce in general and he would also appear to be very lenient in the case of women leaving their husbands in particular.

If Paul does not deal with the question of divorce here, what is he referring to then? I venture the hypothesis that he is dealing with the case of a woman who leaves her husband on spiritual grounds in order to dedicate herself to a life of devotion. This hypothesis would explain why in this passage the matter is so onesidedly viewed from the angle of the woman. She is obviously the active part. The resentment caused by her action in her husband need

not surprise us (as it surprised J. Weiss), once we read this passage in the light of the apocryphal acts of the apostles which like to dwell precisely on this kind of tension between a lover and his Christian love in pursuit of a life of ascetic devotion.

There remains, however, one puzzling question: If Paul was prepared in vs. 1-7 to grant no more than temporal interruption of physical intercourse to a married couple and that by mutual consent only, how do we explain his almost complacent acceptance of a fait accompli in vs. 10, 11? There is only one satisfactory answer to this question: In vs. 10, 11 Paul has not married Christians in general in mind, but only widowed Christians who have married again. In v. 9 Paul said, "It is better to marry than to be aflame with passion"; in v. 10 he turns to those who have actually remarried. He exhorts them to remain in the married state, once they have taken this step, and *he* fortifies this ruling by a saying of our Lord (The fact that the saying originally referred to divorce in the strict sense, does not affect our interpretation; Paul obviously believed the saying applicable to the problem under discussion).

We now see that the woman who has left her husband is actually a widow (Whether the Corinthian inquiry presupposes one incident of this kind or several, we are not in a position to determine). Verses 10, 11 lose their puzzling quality when we assume that Paul attempts to deal here with a new situation which had arisen through the emergence of the "order" of widows in Corinth. In face of this new development some women who had married again will have come to doubt the lawfulness of their action and consequently left their husbands to join the "widows." Paul obviously recognises the emergence of this "order" as an authentic growth within the framework of the Church. This reading of the passage would also explain why it is that Paul can appeal to a saying of the Lord and at the same time be so little disturbed by the possibility of it not being obeyed. (It was this observation which led Holsten and J. Weiss to declare the parenthesis in v. 11 spurious.) In virtue of his apostolic authority (v. 40) he recognises an authentic institution of the Church. The manner in which the apostle treats the matter shows, however, clearly that we are still in a period of transition. No criteria exist as yet to determine who is a "real" widow, i.e., to qualify for admission to the "order" (cp. I Tim. 5:9, 16). Paul's injunction to remain a widow or to return to the husband reflects a state of flux. It is possible that there was a considerable coming and going: joining the "widows" and

leaving them again in order to remarry after all (It is even possible that some tried to use the new institution as a convenient passage from one husband to another).

Seen in this historical setting, vs. 10, 11 in no way invalidate our conclusions concerning vs. 1-7. There is no contradiction between Paul's scepticism towards ascetic experiments within marriage in v. 5 and his recognition of the emerging "order" of "widows" in vs. 10, 11, particularly as the main emphasis in this passage lies on the continuation of the married state.

In the following section (vs. 12-16) the distinction between *charisma* and *agape* offers another interesting clue. Paul treats here the subject of mixed marriage. Some Christians appear to have had scruples as to the lawfulness of living together with an unbeliever (a pagan partner). In view of this excessive timidity concerning contact with the "world" (cp. 5:9, 11), Paul advises that Christians should not leave their pagan partners. They are not free to divorce them; if, however, the pagan partner takes the initiative, it is a different matter: they shall not detain him. The arguments which Paul adduces in support of this advice are interesting. First, the pagan partner is "sanctified" or "consecrated" by the Christian partner (in other words: through his relation with the Christian partner—Lietzmann and Moffat think without sufficient reason of sexual relation—the pagan partner is exposed to the power of the Spirit); and secondly, there is a chance that the pagan partner too will become a Christian in the end. Moffat is right in translating v. 16: "O wife, how do you know you may not save your husband? O husband, how do you know you may not save your wife?" Then the passage concludes with the significant "If not: Be it as the Lord has assigned it (v. 17a)."

Verse 17 is universally recognised as a crux of interpretation, but the knot is disentangled once it is realised that v. 17a means something different from v. 17b, a recognition which I owe to Professor G. Harder (Berlin). Harder has further pointed out that *hoos memeriken ho kyrios* (v. 17a) relates in Pauline usage to *charismata* (cp. Rm. 12:3 and II Cor. 10:13). Harder makes, however, not full use of his important observation when he (following traditional lines) relates v. 17a to what follows. That is a mistake. Once it is recognised that v. 17a brings the argument of vs. 12-16 to a conclusion, the whole passage appears in a new light. The use of the term *merizein* offers the clue; by using this term Paul implies that it is a *charisma* when the Christian partner becomes the instru-

ment for his pagan partner's conversion. *Soozein* in v. 16 is a missionary term (J. Weiss) and suggests the apostolic office, i.e., a charismatic office (I Cor. 12:28). In other words, it is not in the Christian's power to win his partner for Christ; he owes such success, if it comes, to a (temporary) charismatic operation of the Spirit. Therefore the whole matter of mixed marriages does not become for Paul an ethical issue, and therefore he does not counter the suggestion of a possible separation with an exhortation to work for the conversion of the pagan partner. Once more, Paul's rigid distinction between *charisma* and *agape* prevents him from raising into an ethical issue what is essentially a matter of charismatic endowment

In v. 17b Paul makes another point which, too, has a direct bearing on the argument in vs. 12-16. Failure to realise this connection has been the source of another misinterpretation of that passage. The majority of commentators disagree with Moffat's rendering of v. 16 and detect a note of scepticism in that question (Grammatically the question can be read in either of the two senses). This is due to an inability to appreciate the true meaning of the words *en de eireenee kekleeken hymas ho theos* (v. 15). (The well testified reading *heemas* betrays an equal lack of understanding by turning the phrase into a religious commonplace). It is generally assumed that Paul has certain provocations in mind which make the marriage intolerable for the Christian partner. Against this common consent of scholarship it must, however, be pointed out that Paul obviously presupposes harmonious relations between the Christian and pagan partners; this seems to be the most obvious implication of his reference to the "consent" of the pagan partner to stay with his (her) Christian partner (vs. 12, 13). These mixed marriages are not in danger because of certain provocations issuing from the pagan partner but because of certain scruples resting with the Christian partner. These Christians Paul reminds in v. 15 that they lived in peace with their partner at the time of their conversion. Why then disturb this peace? From what follows in vs. 18-24 there can be no doubt that *en de eireenee kekleeken hymas ho theos* in v. 15 relate to the external condition in which the Christian happened to be at the time of his conversion. The principle which he formulates in vs. 18-24 in its most radical application, the apostle wishes to see applied also to the case of mixed marriages. "Let everyone lead the life in which God has called him (v. 17b, 24)" applies here too.

After his excursus concerning the external circumstances in which a Christian happens to live at the time of his call (vs. 17b-24) Paul returns to his proper subject and deals yet with another question which the Corinthians had put to him. It is the matter of the *parthenoi* (vs. 25-38). *Parthenos* can be both male and female (cp. Apc. 14:4), and some scholars believe that the term must be taken in this sense in the present context. This leads to the assumption that the passage refers to men and women alike who have performed a vow of chastity. The context hardly bears this out. The majority of commentators believe that vs. 25-28 refer to unmarried girls in general and that Paul takes up the matter of a specific class of *parthenoi* only after the excursus of vs. 29-35. There is, however, not the slightest indication that Paul's argument passes from one class of *parthenoi* to another. The *parthenoi* are the same right through the whole passage (vs. 25-38). This plain fact has been recently emphasised with all due vigour by Professor Oepke (Leipzig) in an article on what he considers definite errors of judgment in recent Pauline research (*Theol. Lit. Ztg* 1952, 8, 449ss). But he defends a lost cause when he tries to resuscitate the old view that *parthenoi,* in this context, are simply unmarried young girls and that Paul discusses the question whether the father is right in seeking a husband for his girl or not. In line with this general interpretation Oepke defends the ancient identification of *tis* in v. 36 with the father of the girl and relates *hyperakmos* (v. 36) (It can mean either "of excessive sexual vigour" or "past the bloom of youth") to the girl. But this interpretation is fraught with difficulties. One fails to see a.o. how it is that the father should sin in giving his daughter to marriage and why he should need the apostle's assurance that he does not sin by doing so. Further, the words: "Whoever is firmly established in his heart, being under no necessity but having his desire under control, and has determined to keep her as his betrothed he will do well (v. 37)," when applied to the father, are pure nonsense. Finally, there is no getting away from the fact that the term *parthenos* has a technical meaning in this context. The word for the young bride is *nymphee* and not *parthenos.* Since the passage makes it quite clear that the girls are engaged to young men, we should expect the term *nymphee* if the passage referred to engagements quite generally. It is this recognition which led scholars like Grafe and Achelis to advance the hypothesis which has come to be associated with their names. According to them vs. 36-38 at any rate are evidence of the practice of

spiritual engagements in Corinth. In connection with this thesis the practice of spiritual concubinage by Paul of Samosata and his clergy has been quoted as an analogy (Euseb., h.e. vii, 30:12, 14). Here once more we join forces with Oepke who has cast aside this hypothesis; he is right when he insists that the *parthenoi* in I Cor. 7 are not *virgines subintroductae* or *syneisakioi* ("contraband women," as Paul of Samosata's companions were called by his critics).

If we can neither agree with Oepke's identification of the *parthenoi* nor with that of the followers of the *syneisaktoi hypothesis,* what alternative have we to offer? So much is clear, the passage deals neither with engagements in the ordinary sense nor with "spiritual" engagements in which both partners are under a vow of chastity. The female partner only is a *parthenos* (v. 28). The whole context suggests that some young women have taken a vow of chastity, obviously after their engagement, and that this action on their part has produced the problem which Paul tries to tackle in vs. 25-38. The question is, whether the young men must respect these vows or not. As the emergence of the "order" of "widows" was behind vs. 10, 11, so we detect here the emergence of a similar "order" of "virgins." Paul apparently assumes that the *parthenoi* have the *charisma* of virginity, for in no wise does he question their ability to keep their vows. In contrast to them, the young men are neither under a vow nor have they the *charisma* of celibacy; otherwise the whole problem which Paul tries to solve would not have arisen. The manner in which Paul deals with the problem is significant. The decisive question is for him whether the young men will be able to sustain the continence which the vows of the young women imposes upon them. This is the burden not only of vs. 36-38, but also of the questions in v. 27. *Dedesai* refers there neither to marriage nor to the engagement. The whole point is that the young people are not yet married (consequently any reference to divorce is out of the question) and that they are engaged (consequently there is no sense in enquiring whether they are). *Dedesai* (and *lelysai*) refer rather to the sexual bond (For the invisible "chain" which "binds" the man to the woman cp. Prov. 30:19). *Gynee* in v. 27 and *parthenos* in v. 28 refer to the same person. Paul asks the young man whether he is "bound" to his *parthenos* in the manner in which a man is bound to a woman. If so, he commits no sin if he marries her; if not, he shall respect her vows (*teerein teen heautou parthenon* in v. 37). In other words, Paul sees to

it that the *charisma* of the *parthenoi* does not tyrannise their human relations. In contrast to the fictitious Paul of the Acts of Thecla, the real Paul did not encourage a dualistic morality hostile to marriage; on the contrary he removes any scruples which might prevent a couple from marrying when in fact the moral welfare of one of the partners demands it. In short, when a *charisma* or the moral welfare of a brother is at issue, no real alternative exists for Paul: *Agape* takes precedence of the *charismata.*

Verses 32-35 must be taken strictly within this context. This excursus does not relate to marriage in general, but to the situation of the *parthenoi* and their young men only. If Paul had thought of marriage in general, he would not only have been guilty of a very bad piece of psychology in vs. 32b-34, but he would also be guilty of contradicting himself. He would have abandoned the realism of vs. 1-7 and 8,9 for an ascetic dream world, a step which runs right countre to his conception of the gift of continence as a *charisma.*

It may, perhaps, be objected to our interpretation that it puts Paul in a rather odd light when he expects a woman who has taken the vow of virginity to abandon it if her fiance so demands, while, on the other hand, he expects a married man to accept the position when his wife has left him for the order of widows. But there is really nothing odd about this seeming inconsistency once one considers the difference in age, in the two instances, of the male partners. The young man has in fact nothing but the proximity of the end of this dispensation on his side (v. 29) when he attempts a life of continence; as to the older man, Paul obviously was more confident that he would be able to sustain a life of continence even without the *charisma.*

I Cor. 7 closes with a brief passage (vs. 39, 40) unrelated to the question of *parthenoi.* Commentators generally believe that these verses take up once more the subject of vs. 8, 9. We cannot agree. In each case Paul appeals to two distinct classes of women. The women in vs. 39, 40 are not widows; they are still married (*ean de koimeethee ho aneer* implies this). Paul assures them that after the death of their husband they are free to marry whomever they wish, provided the new marriage is *en kyrioo;* personally, he feels, however, that they would be "happier" as widows.

These women obviously suffer from some provocation or other; Paul's stipulation that the next marriage should be *en kyrioo* most likely implies that the present husband

is not in sympathy with the Christian faith and that he makes trouble on that account. *En kyrioo* is usually taken to mean that the next husband must be a Christian; the phrase can, however, also be taken in a wider sense. In that case, all that Paul insists on is that the woman's choice is to be governed by Christian motives, "consistent with her Christian profession" (McFadyen). It is possible that we have in the phrase *monon en kyrioo* the affirmative statement of a principle that appears in its negative form in Gl. 5:13: *monon mee teen eleutherian eis aphormeen tee sarki.*

The women live apparently in a mixed marriage with a pagan partner. In contrast to vs. 12-16, however, the matter of mixed marriages is not discussed here principally; Paul discusses specific difficulties within such marriages. It is not very probable that the passage refers to difficulties within a Christian marriage. In that case we would have expected a different treatment of the subject.

In closing I wish to remind the reader that I called this essay quite deliberately an "attempt" to understand I Cor. 7. The article has been written in a desire to open a discussion rather than to conclude it.

Dunedin. H. H. REX.

Worship in the Reformed Church

The most distinctive feature of the doctrine of God in the New Testament is the stress laid on the love of God. His love is not evoked by the worth of the object loved, but is pure self-giving. "God commendeth his own love towards us that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8, cf I John 4:10). Mediæval doctrine and worship obscured the love of God. Purgatory was the anticipated lot after death, while life here was made miserable by the belief that God was pleased by asceticism, self-torture and painful "good works." That God was a cruel tyrant was Tyndale's judgment of the opinion of the common people of his time, who dare not pray to God directly, but only through the intercession of the Virgin and the saints. The Reformers emphasized once more the biblical doctrine of the love of God. The leading theological concept which controlled the thought of all the Reformers, Calvin and Zwingli as well as Luther, was their sense of the love, goodness and beneficence of God. The love of God is not an abstract attribute but is ever active in self-giving. Its most distinctive activity is the provision of complete redemption in Christ. The attempt to patch out this complete

redemption by the addition of our own good works was, as is well known, the centre of the Reformers' controversy with the Church of Rome. The Catechism of the Council of Trent declared that "painful and laborious works are a compensation for past sin. They must in some way be disagreeable." But the Reformers insisted that this Roman doctrine was not to be found in Scripture and moreover was contradicted by Scripture, which clearly teaches that there is complete and full forgiveness of all past sin to all who will call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The gratuitiousness, or gift character of salvation is the outcome and itself a revelation of the wonderful love of God. The full provision and free offer of salvation in Jesus Christ is the supreme example, as far as sinful sinners are concerned, of God's love.

How should such a God be worshipped? The Reformers answered that trust in God's love is the only adequate way of acknowledging His nature. Other elements of worship, as adoration, praise, thanksgiving, offering, are consequences of the supreme worship and acknowledgment that God is the God that He is. Such acknowledgment is rendered by our trusting Him and by our accepting His provision. The statement that faith (i.e., trust in God's promises) is the essence of Christian worship occurs frequently in the Reformers' writings. Thus in Joye's Primer of 1529 (which is the earliest Reformation Prayer Book to appear in English) there is this anthem: "The highest praise and greatest glory that we may give to God is to believe His promise and to verify it with our faith." In his preface to his translation of Isaiah, published in 1531, Joye wrote: "Praise and glorify we God when we believe that Christ is given us to die for our righteous-making." This doctrine finds support in Scripture, e.g., in Psalm 50 where the writer deprecates worship through animal sacrifices and says that the true worship acceptable with God is to put trust in Him in time of trouble (Ps. 50:15). Similarly, in Psalm 116, the Psalmist states that the true worship of a thankful heart, sensible of God's mercies, is rendered paradoxically, by the acceptance of God's supreme mercy in the provision of salvation (Ps. 116:13).

The Reformers taught that faith and trust is supreme worship and the basic way of acknowledging God's essential character of self-giving. The application of this doctrine to the private devotional life is straightforward. Every day brings its opportunities of trusting God and so acknowledging that He is trustworthy, that He is indeed a God of

love. So all life becomes worship and there is no divorce between Sunday and the week day. Private Bible reading is an essential concomitant of the worship of faith. In order to live the life of faith the promises of God must be known. For faith in something which has not the promise of God is superstition, and indeed, idolatry. For it involves trust in something created by men's imagination and will in place of trust in the true God as He has revealed Himself. This thought was the basis of the repeated charge of idolatry that the Reformers brought against the Papists. To put trust for salvation in rites which had no more support than church tradition was idolatry, and the depriving of the true God of His due honour. Yet mediæval worship consisted in almost nothing else than this. For this reason, the reading of the Bible and its exposition in the sermon were essential elements in public worship. For unless the people heard the scriptures in their own language and undertood its meaning, their faith could not be rightly directed to the true promises of God.

The Holy Communion office of the Church of England's Book of Common Prayer illustrates how the Reformers applied the doctrine that faith is worship to that service. It begins with the recitation of the Ten Commandments, the summary of God's law, so that the worshipper may realize his need of God's mercy. The law drives us to Christ. In the Absolution which follows the Confession, it is noticeable how the emphasis falls on the promises of God to forgive repentant and believing sinners. This was deliberate; for, years before, when the Bishops' Book was being revised, Cranmer had protested to Henry VIII about the form of absolution in the King's amendments to that book, "The promise . . . is stricken out, which chiefly ought to be known." As the Service proceeds there are many foci for faith in the passages of scripture, in the sermon, in the exhortation and especially in the four comfortable words, which were introduced into the service by the Reformers. But God's character is seen supremely in the words of institution, in the fraction and in the distribution. Here ear, eye and taste combine to write on the soul's consciousness the fact of God's love in Jesus Christ for lost sinners. The Reformers insisted that the manual acts of the celebrant should be visible, and the words which accompanied them clearly enunciated in the common language. For these things strengthen faith, which adores God's grace by receiving His provision. Faith is essentially personal. A faith which does not accept for itself is an undetected lie. In this connection it is noteworthy the

fourfold repetition in the brief words of institution of the words "for thee." "Given for thee," "shed for thee." John Frith, martyred in 1533, almost twenty years before this Communion service was composed, showed what the Reformer's intention was in stressing these words "for thee." He wrote: "In this supper we hear Christ speaking to us, feeding us with his body, proferring us that we should drink his blood for eternal life. When he saith, 'Take, eat, this is my body, which for you is given . . .', good brother, think that these words be spoken to thee. Print them most deeply in thy mind, for when he speakest to all he speakest also to thee, to thee; to thee I say they profit. All things that Christ hath suplyed shall profit thee no less than they do help Peter and Paul, for the promise soundeth so, the which he that receiveth by faith and believeth that which He hath saith 'given for you and shed out for you,' hath and obtained without doubt remission of his sins." Faith and worship reach their climax in the service in "taking the cup of salvation" which the love of God provided for needy sinners. There follows further faith for daily needs (The Lord's Prayer); the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies; the prayer of thanksgiving, and the adoration of the Gloria. The whole emphasis of the service is on God's movement towards man. Our movement towards God, the response of faith and thanksgiving and offering, is secondary and complementary.

The essence of petitional prayer is faith. The worshipper in bringing his needs to God, in specific petition full of faith that he will be heard, worships God for he acknowledges by this action that God is a God of love who cares and provides for His children. This is God's essential character. And it cannot be acknowledged by the worshipper in any other way, this omitted. Petition (though not selfish petition!) is the chief element in Christian prayer. Our Lord when asked to teach His disciples to pray, gave them a prayer which consisted in nothing else than petition. It is good to notice that the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis put this Reformation emphasis on personal faith first in its definition of worship. "In our worship we accept by faith God's gift of Himself to us. . . ."

D. BROUGHTON KNOX.

Sydney.

Books Reviews

ONE BODY IN CHRIST: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul.

By Ernest Best (S.P.C.K.), 1955, pp. xii-250; 25/-.

The publishers justly claim that this is an important contribution to an understanding of the nature of the Church. It is an attractive, scholarly study, depending for its persuasiveness upon a patient, sober, and discerning examination of relevant New Testament evidence. In its positive exposition it offers a sound corrective of some of the more subjective and extravagant views purporting to present a doctrine of the Church.

The author's method is to consider in turn the various phrases which Paul uses in describing the relationship between Christ and his Church. Separate chapters are given to detailed study of each of the phrases, "in Christ," "with Christ," "into Christ," "members of Christ," and of the comparison of Christ to Adam. Then the phrase, "the Body of Christ," is considered at length: first as it is used in the earlier epistles, next in Colossians, and finally in Ephesians. There are also chapters in which are discussed "the Building in Christ," and "the Bride of Christ." The concluding chapter, "Christ and the Church," sets down a number of conclusions that have emerged, and seeks to unify them.

As against E. L. Mascall and others, Dr. Best refuses, and he gives solid grounds for his refusal, to regard the Church as "ontologically and realistically" the Body of Christ. He shows convincingly that the figure of the "body" is one of several metaphors or "picture-phrases," and that Paul does not always apply these in the same way. He finds the most satisfactory clue to Paul's conception of the relation between Christ and the Church in "the idea of Christ as an inclusive or corporate personality," yet is careful to develop even this suggestive "mystical idea" with some reserve. It is a conception which cannot be reduced to logical terms, and that is why Paul rationalizes it into metaphors, "in Christ," "dead and risen with Christ," "Body of Christ," "bride," "temple," etc. Each of these points to some aspect of the Church, but it must not be unduly pressed. Paul's phrases are closely dependent upon one another, but none is basic to the others. Moreover, Christ is not to be identified with the Church. For within the corporate personality, which is only a part of Paul's thought, Christ holds quite a unique place. "Christians may, as it were, stand alongside him in it ('with Christ') but he acts for them; they share in his experience and its consequences, but they do not help to create the experience—that is all Christ's doing, and done for them." Throughout the earlier epistles "Paul continually depicts Christ over against the Church and separate from it as the Lord and Saviour of believers."

Consequently, certain common views of the relationship between Christ and the Church must be ruled out. That which regards the Church simply as bearing witness to Christ and emphasizes the Lordship of Christ over the Church is inadequate because it ignores the mutual relationships of Christians to one another as well as their organic relation to Christ. It is not sufficient to describe the Church as the "communion of saints." Again, the attractive view which regards the Church as an extension of the Incarnation is rejected for a number of cogent reasons; chief of which are, that it ignores the uniqueness of Jesus and the redemption that is in him, as well as the important distinction of Jesus from the Church; and that it absolutizes one of Paul's metaphors, treats it as literal instead of figurative, and makes it determinative of Paul's whole doctrine.

C. STEWART PETRIE.

Stawell, Vic.

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF THE ACTS.

The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, by F. F. Bruce (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1954, pp. 555; $6.

This is the second full-scale commentary Mr. Bruce has published on the Acts, his Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text having appeared in 1951. The present volume is part of the New International Commentary on the New Testament (R.T.R., Feb. 1954) and is an exposition of the American Standard Version of 1901. The difference between the two is that the "former treatise" is exegetical, devoted to linguistic, textual and historical criticism, whereas the latter is expositional, making clear the theological and practical meaning and implications of the text, but incorporating in summary form much of the exegetical material of the other. Scholars, preachers and Bible students will find this commentary invaluable.

Mr. Bruce is a layman who belongs to the Brethren but who shows many marks of the Presbyterian environment of his Scottish upbringing. He was first a classical scholar and teacher, having studied at Aberdeen (as pupil and protege of Dr. Alexander Souter), Cambridge and Vienna, and having taught in the universities of Edinburgh and Leeds. His increasing interest and qualifications in biblical studies brought him to the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Shefield. In 1950 he succeeded Professor J. H. S. Burleigh as editor of *The Evangelical Quarterly*.

There are three outstanding characteristics of this commentary. First, full and excellent historical comment is provided in the main part of the exposition: this is a necessity in the Acts. Secondly, footnotes deal expertly with such linguistic questions as have bearing on the main exposition and also refer to a large range of relevant literature right up to 1953; a virtue here being that Mr. Bruce's acquaintance is not only with the main stream of critical study but with other sources not commonly met with in such an erudite treatment. Finally, the book, if not a theological commentary predominantly, has a distinct theological aim. It is hard to see how even in 555 pages it could be more theological than it is, but even so, Mr. Bruce places his materials at the feet of the theologian all ready for use. If he is somewhat less theological than R. B. Rackham, for example, it is at least arguable that his treatment leads the reader to a better theological understanding of Acts than does Rackham. Good use is made of the work of men like Dodd and Geoffrey Lampe ("The Seal of the Spirit").

Mr. Bruce has a terse and direct style; he wastes no words and he has packed an enormous amount of sound learning and ripe observation into this volume. He deals fully and carefully with *cruces*, e.g., the Council of Jerusalem, holding himself (with Calvin and many others) that Galatians was written shortly before the Council.

One criticism: many Western readings are given, but no guidance as to their reliability or otherwise. Mr. Bruce deals fully with this in his first volume. On page 56, "the consequences . . . was" needs correction.

Sydney. D. W. B. Robinson.

THE MISSION AND ACHIEVEMENT OF JESUS.

By R. H. Fuller (S.C.M., Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 12), 1954, pp. 128; 8/-.

LIFE IN CHRIST.

By Theo Preiss (S.C.M., Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 13), 1954, pp. 104; 7/-.

The occasion of Professor Fuller's essay is the challenge of Professor Bultmann, now summarised and made available to English

readers in Vol. 1 of his *Theology of the New Testament*, whereby the faith of the early Church is seen to have invested the earthly history of Jesus of Nazareth with a redemptive significance to which we cannot be sure that Jesus himself laid claim. Professor Fuller examines the crucial sayings about the imminence of the kingdom, the signs and the parables of the coming kingdom to demonstrate the strength of Bultmann's view "that Jesus was an eschatological prophet who announced the impending advent of the Reign of God, and his own person and activity as the signs of its coming," at any rate as against the realized eschatology of Professor C. H. Dodd. He then, by careful examination of the text offers what he claims is "an intelligible, consistent explanation of the death of Jesus, and one which stands in organic relation with his proclamation: 'The Kingdom of God is at hand'." It is at this point that Bultman is found most unsatisfactory—the cruciality of the cross to Jesus himself. We have here then the missing link between the teaching of Jesus and the faith of the early Church. It is possible to gain from the hints about his own person and vocation which Jesus thus gives, the raw materials of Christology; and Professor Fuller gives considerable account of these in the last forty pages of his book.

It will be seen even from such a crude summary that Professor Fuller's essay is one sustained piece of argument, carefully documented throughout. It will remain a most valuable contribution to the discussion for as long as Professor Bultmann's persistent and far-reaching question is honestly faced. Professor Fuller has rightly taken Bultmann seriously.

Life in Christ contains five essays by the late Theo Preiss, selected from the volume published after his death by his friend, Professor Roger Mehl. The French edition contains a memoir entitled "Theo Preiss, theologien": at one point the editor qualifies that with the adjective "robuste." The description gives an adequate impression of these essays: the robust, searching quality of this Biblical theology is matched by a striking style which makes most theological writing seem pedestrian. The essays are on "Justification in Johannine Thought," "Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon," "The Mystery of the Son of Man," "The Vision of History in the New Testament," "Was the Last Supper a Paschal Meal?"—most of them familiar enough themes, but each one of them treated with freshness and contributing original suggestions. It may be, it is, difficult to define Biblical Theology; but here at least one can recognise a Biblical theologian.

Professor Fuller's essay is dedicated to the memory of E. C. Hoskyns and J. M. Creed and in its care, seriousness and balance is by no means unworthy of the great tradition of Cambridge scholarship within which it is written. Preiss conveys in his writings the sense of urgency which Biblical understanding gave to a brilliant and very contemporary continental European. We need them both.

J. D. McCAUGHEY.

Melbourne.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE LATER FATHERS.
Edited by Edward Rochie Hardy, in collaboration with Cyril C. Richardson (S.C.M., The Library of Christian Classics, vol. iii), 1954, pp. 400; 30/-.

These selections, chiefly from Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa, have been made by E. R. Hardy of the Berkeley Divinity School. The complete volume is prefaced by an introduction which provides the historical setting for the several works. The

introduction is not only historical: it is also topical. The editor points outs that our problems and preoccupations are very different from those of the Fathers: "Ever since the fifth century we have been accustomed to consider that the central problem of Christology is how to maintain the true humanity of the Saviour without obscuring the affirmation that God was indeed acting in Christ. The first four centuries faced rather a different problem in the intellectual definition of the faith—to assert the true deity of the God who abode in Christ without obscuring the ancient faith of Israel that 'the Lord our God, the Lord is one'."

The editor's style is racy and memorable. He says that Arius—like Dean Inge—was possessed of "a certain bumptiousness not unknown among cultured theologians"; he quotes with approval one of Arius' verses as paraphrased by Miss Dorothy Sayers:

"If you want the Logos doctrine, I can serve it hot and hot:
God begat him and before he was begotten he was not;"

and he describes Athanasius' work "On the Incarnation" as his "B.D. thesis."

But these are points of incidental interest. The works of Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus are reprinted from the edition in the Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (with minor alterations); but the works of Gregory of Nyssa appear in new versions. Apart from these major works by these representative theologians, there are also valuable documents relating to the Christological controversy. There is the letter of Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia; the confession of the Arians addressed to Alexander of Alexandria; the letter of Eusebius of Caesarea describing the Council of Nicaea; the Creed of Ariminum; dogmatic letters of Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria; the formula of Union of 433 and the Tome of Leo and the statement of faith of the Third Council of Constantinople. Each document is preceded by an individual introduction. The information given is both factual and illuminating, and these summaries are excellently done.

This collection of documents will be an invaluable aid to students. A diminishing number have an easy familiarity with Latin and Greek: and these competent English translations will be the more welcome. In these times Philistines possess the land, and classical and cultural studies, if not prescribed, are not encouraged. Nevertheless, the study of historical theology cannot flourish without reference to the documents concerned: and the sponsors of "The Library of Christian Classics" are to be commended both on their enterprise and achievement. The present volume is not the least valuable in an impressive series.

S. BARTON BABBAGE.

Melbourne.

STUDIEN ZU PAULUS.

By G. Schrenk (Zwingli Verlag, Zuerich), 1954, pp. 148, Fr. 14.

The present volume was published on occasion of the 75th birthday of Gottlob Schrenk who at one time occupied the chair of N.T. studies at Zuerich University. On this occasion, a time honoured procedure has been abandoned, and Professor Schrenk's pupils, instead of presenting him with some fruits of their own thought, have preferred to offer, so to speak in a new basket, some of the mature fruit of their master's thought. We owe them gratitude for this "self-denying ordinance."

Those who are familiar with G. Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch will already appreciate the fine and sensitive scholarship of Professor

Schrenk. This volume of Pauline studies contains five essays, all previously published elsewhere, dating from 1932 to 1948. The first gives us a number of rabbinical portraits (Hillel, Gamaliel I, Jochanan ben Zakkai, Akiba); the second deals with Paul's view of history; the third analyses the Ep. to the Romans as a missionary document; the fourth defines Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit over against the phenomenon of "enthusiasm"; and in the final essay Schrenk discusses an analysis by Martin Dibelius of Paul's sermon on the Areopagus.

The whole volume is distinguished by the sane and balanced judgment of the author. Schrenk has no axes to grind. Only in one case contemporary controversies seem to have affected his judgment. I wonder whether he would hold the view that the Ep. to the Romans was a refutation of Antisemitism as emphatically to-day as at the original date of publication: 1933.

The main bulk of the book comes as a timely contribution to the present discussion concerning Paul's relation to rabbinic Judaism. The fact that these essays were not originally written as contributions to this discussion is a definite advantage. It is sincerely hoped that they will help to restore the balance which has been gravely upset by the recent work of O. Cullmann and W. D. Davies who wish to persuade us to see the Apostle in a more rabbinical light than the evidence will allow.

Gottlob Schrenk is the son of a well-known missionary. This missionary background qualifies him well to view Paul's epistles from the missionary situation in which they were written. It proves also a valuable equipment for a more penetrating analysis of Paul's sermon on the Areopagus than Martin Dibelius' thesis that the sermon foreshadows the work of the second century Apologists.

An English translation of this altogether delightful volume would be very welcome indeed.

H. H. REX.

Dunedin.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

By E. K. Simpson (Tyndale Press, London), 1954, pp. 174; 15/-.

Conservative students of the New Testament have for long been awaiting this commentary, and there is no doubt that it will receive a warm welcome at their hands. Since P. N. Harrison's careful and detailed study in which he assembled a large amount of statistical information designed to show that the writer of the Pastorals could not have been the apostle Paul, few have been found to maintain the Pauline authorship. Mr. Simpson doubts the usefulness of the method employed by Dr. Harrison, since "It is said that anything can be proved by an array of statistics adroitly manipulated," and in any case, he shows that there are important considerations pointing in the other direction. If few will feel that Harrison has been adequately met, at least Mr. Simpson shows that the authorship of these Epistles is not the closed question it is often assumed to be.

The method employed, following the Introduction, is to cite brief passages of the Greek text and then to give a lucid and informed commentary on them. Students of all schools of thought will be indebted to the author for his discussion of the significance of the Greek terms used, for he shows a wide knowledge as well of classical Greek as of the Koine, and again and again he illuminates the passage under discussion with the parallels he is able to cite. Similarly he is quite at home both with the Patristic writers and with modern commentators.

Of particular points, there is an excellent note on the use of *huper* in which he has no difficulty in showing that the commonly held idea that the preposition never denotes substitution is incorrect, drawing his examples from Biblical and classical Greek and from the papyri. He prefers the A.V. to the R.V. in the rendering of II Tim. 3:16, and regards the deposit of II Tim. 1:12 as what Paul entrusts to God rather than of the message entrusted to him. In I Tim. 2:6 he thinks of *antilutron* as signifying a "counter-ransom-price." Everywhere the discussion is most illuminating.

The commentary is written throughout in a very entertaining style, and while some may cavil at his doughty thrusts at his opponents, it must be admitted that this is an important work. It is a pity that more has not been given to us, but we must be thankful for what we have.

Melbourne. LEON MORRIS.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY, 1547-1603.

By H. F. Woodhouse (Church Historical Society, S.P.C.K.), 1954, pp. 223; 25/-.

This book was prepared as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Divinity of the University of Dublin. It embodies much laborious industry and painstaking research. The result is an historical investigation, based upon a study of the contemporary writings concerning the doctrine of the Church held by Anglican theologians of the sixteenth century. The value of this research is undoubted. It contributes valuable historical evidence to the present animated discussion concerning the ministry. In Anglican circles the discussion revolves around the question of episcopacy: is episcopacy of the *esse* of the Church, or of the *bene esse?* The answer to this question is ultimately a biblical and theological one: but it is also useful to know what Anglican theologians thought and taught in the formative days of the Reformation. The views of the Caroline divines are well known: but what did Cranmer and Hooker and Whitgift hold? The author come to a clear and convincing conclusion on these matters. These Anglican theologians believed that episcopacy was of apostolical (perhaps even of *divine*) appointment, but nevertheless not the only form of Church government. They favoured its retention on historical rather than on theological grounds. It was not a matter of faith.

It is a refreshing corrective to learn how these early Anglicans understood the phrase "apostolic succession." To-day, it means (in many circles) a kind of "tactual" or "pipe-line" mechanical succession from the Apostles to their episcopal successors (see "The Apostolic Ministry" p. 200): to these sixteenth century Anglicans it meant a succession in apostolic doctrine. "The need for truth of doctrine and succession in faith was repeated often; it was by truth of doctrine that the Church could be discerned, not by bare or naked succession" (p. 96). It is clear that these Anglicans regarded the right administration of the Sacraments and the faithful practice of the Word of God as the essential "marks" of the Church. This is the position maintained in Article 19. No reference is made to ministry or polity. These Anglicans did not believe that one type of ministry was always and everywhere binding on all believers. Whitgift indeed pointed out that the form of Church government depended upon time and place. Consequently, the Church of England did not condemn the Churches of Geneva, Helvetia, Germany, and Scotland, because they had received another form of ecclesiastical government. Bancroft said that the ordination given by presbyters

must be accounted lawful else the position of all the Reformed Churches would be placed in jeopardy.

The author is quick to point out the importance of these findings in relation to present-day discussions of reunion. "It must be carefully pondered whether those who retain an episcopal system have any real right to insist that, as an unalterable principle, ministers of other bodies, which they admit are parts of the Church, must be re-ordained or even re-commissioned episcopally. Thus no type or form was absolutely vital, though custom and practice gave a very decided preference in all ordinary cases to the episcopal system. Yet it was recorded that one form was not necessary and that it was the Holy Spirit who has directed continental Churches to retain liberty of action with regard to polity, and Anglicans should not condemn them." "Anglican fathers of Tudor times did not say that Christian bodies lacking bishops had a defective ministry; on the contrary, they allowed for exceptions to episcopal government. The Articles of Elizabeth's reign did not speak of any type of Church order as essential to the life of the Church. They would not have made the strong statement that the episcopate was the only means whereby our Lord commissioned each new minister in his Church. They realized that all things historically valuable might not be theologically necessary. There were divergences of opinion as to whether episcopacy was established divinely or apostolically or in what other way, though the majority, especially after Elizabeth's accession, would have attached themselves to one of the first two alternatives. They would have held that the Holy Spirit directed the Church to adopt the episcopal system."

The quotations from and references to the contemporary Anglican writers are valuable, although there are some strange omissions. There are few references to the Elizabethan puritans, although the debate between Whitgift and Cartwright was one of determinative significance. Cartwright's name, indeed, does not appear in the index and only once in the text. The author relies heavily on Book VII of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," and some discussion of its authenticity might have been properly included. The initials of authors quoted in the footnotes are generally omitted, although these are some exceptions. On p. 30, n. 5, "M" should be "N", on p. 36 "Covel" should be "Covell," and on p. 55 n. "4" is missing. These. however, are minor blemishes.

This is a timely and informative study: a healthy and belated corrective to the extravagent and untenable claims and assertions of Anglo-Catholic theologians.

S. BARTON BABBAGE.

Melbourne.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Old Testament in Modern Research, by Herbert F. Hahn (Muhlenberg, $4), bears as a subtitle "A Comprehensive Synthesis of Modern Trends in Bible Studies." This subtitle is no misnomer. The book is an encyclopedia of authors, literature and tendencies in study, and though not complete, is truly comprehensive. Beginning with the 18th century the whole story is told of O.T. criticism, in such a manner, moreover, that what could be a dry catalogue, becomes under Hahn's hand a fascinating story. He deals with the early Critical approach to the O.T., then the Anthropological approach of last century; thereafter he describes the rise of the Religio-historical school and of its child the Form-critical school. Each of these chapters is provided with a full bibliography in all European

languages. There follows what we know little of here, a discussion of the Sociological approach, largely an American movement of the period between the wars. Then he gives a conspectus of the work done on Archæology in its relation to O.T. studies, and concludes with a survey of the literature of the present day which lays greater stress on a theological understanding of the O.T. The book is of value even if it is used as a bibliography alone.

Studies in the Book of Lamentations, by Normal K. Gottwald (S.C.M., 8/-), is literally an outstandingly valuable addition to the series "Studies in Biblical Theology." As the author himself says, virtually no *theological* work has been done on that little O.T. book, most commentators having merely concerned themselves with critical questions such as those of date and authorship. This study opens with a new translation. Thereafter, in a discussion on the nature and purpose of the acrostic poem as a medium of communication, the author puts forward the interesting theory that the acrostic is employed to express the complete range of human emotions "from A to Z." However, it is the careful analysis of the message of the book that is the important part. Firstly it faces boldly what for Israel was the excruciating question of the total destruction of the "righteous" nation in 586 B.C., and recognises, the author points out, that Israel here viewed that event as an act of a God of justice. This is true even though the punishment does not seem to fit the crime. But Lamentations takes seriously the facts of the wrath of God and the heinousness of sin. But it also provides us with a true theology of hope, such as grows only through submission in suffering, and which only then can reach out in faith to an understanding of God's "strange" ways. Gottwald has rescued Lamentations from oblivion and shown it to us as one of the "hinge" books of the Old Testament revelation.

G. A. F. Knight.

Studies in Isaiah, by Edward J. Young (Eerdmans, $2.50, Tyndale 12/6). In eight splendid chapters, Dr. Young traverses again many of the old problems in Isaiah. His first three chapters give a review of the study of Isaiah from the days of Joseph Alexander—whose commentary appeared in 1836—until 1940. Of all commentaries, he commends that of Alexander, with his accurate exegesis of the Hebrew text. Dr. Young shows himself competent to handle a wide range of languages relevant to clear Biblical Exegesis. In his two chapters on the Servant of the Lord, in two chapters on the Immanuel prophecy and in a chapter on the interpreation of "yazzeh" (Isaiah 52:5) he draws on Hebrew, Ugaritic and Arabic and moreover knows his LXX and Vulgate Texts. He has a splendid discussion on the meaning of "Almah" (Isa. 7:14) and concludes that "Virgin" is the best translation. He does not hesitate to press the claim that the Servant and Immanuel are Christ Himself and that Isa 52:5 refers to the Messiah's atoning work. He rejects all other claims after a fair, scholarly and well-documented discussion of them. We sincerely hope that he will give us his own commentary one day. He promises this in the preface. Incidentally, he quotes from this Journal on page 183, but rejects the opinion of G. A. Knight, on *Almah*.

The Messianic prophecies of Daniel, by E. J. Young (Eerdmans, $1.50). Dr. E. J. Young has two classes of people in mind in this book . . . those who reject the sixth century composition of the book, and those who hold the dispensationalist theories of the Scofield Bible. For the first class, he insists that the book portrays a personal Messiah in chapter 9, verse 27. For the second class he

rejects the theory that the Church age is a parenthesis in God's time plan. As usual, Dr. Young shows that he knows the literature dealing with Daniel. Each individual prophecy is carefully discussed from various angles. Christ is the central figure upon which the message of Daniel rests, and His Messianic work is seen under the sixfold heading of "Restraining transgression," "Making an end of sins," "Making reconciliation for iniquity," "Bringing in everlasting righteousness," "Sealing up vision of prophecy" and "Anointing the most Holy." As to the identity of the fourth kingdom, Dr. Young holds that only Rome can satisfy the requirements. He rejects Rowley's attempts to identify the ten horns with the Syrian kings and says that these kings are not a succession, but are contemporaneous. Dr. Young does not press the number ten. It is symbolic of those kingdoms which follow Rome until the return of Jesus Christ from heaven.

J. A. Thompson.

Prayer Book Revision in England 1800-1900, by R. C. D. Jasper (S.P.C.K. 13/6), is an interesting study in contrasting attitudes. It is noteworthy that before 1800 the object of suggested revisions was uniformly the comprehension of Dissenters (not Romanists) within the Church of England. Doctrinal issues (particularly the use of the Athanasian Creed) continued to dominate the discussions during the early part of the 19th Century. As the author points out, in the latter years of the century the issues raised were mainly liturgical in character, although of course it is quite impossible to divorce the two; later generations of Tractarians simply carried the conclusions of their more moderate predecessors to a logical end. The author gives a useful summary of the development of the Oxford Movement, with which he is evidently in sympathy. He sets forth "loyalty to the Prayer Book" as a feature of the early Tractarian position. It is interesting to observe that before about 1850 the High Churchmen were opposed to revision; after then it was largely from the Anglo-Catholics that demands for revision came. This follows from the entry of liturgical questions into the discussions, and the "Permissive Variations to the Book of Common Prayer" set out in the proposed Constitution of the Church of England in Australia show that it is still from this quarter that dissatisfaction with the Prayer Book chiefly comes.

J. A. Friend.

The Secrets of the Kingdom, by George Johnston (Westminster, $2.50). Following closely (but not uncritically) the accounts given in the Gospels and Acts,, the author relates the story of Jesus and His Church, up to the close of the Apostolic age. The book is a harmony of the canonical narrative passages — with imaginative details and interpretative comment at a minimum. Some may be disappointed in this, but the class of reader at whose situation the book is clearly directed — namely, those who need a self-explanatory account in modern language — will find the reading of it very rewarding, especially if they do as the author intends and (with the aid of the "Table of Scripture References" on pp. 217-222) search the Scriptures to see whether these things be so. Much research and thought lie behind what is said so simply. J. F. Peter.

Science and Human Imagination, by Mary B. Hesse (S.C.M., 12/6). This book shows how the outlook of the scientists and the content of their theories have been influenced by the cultural and religious environment and by the prevailing climate of metaphysical speculation.

Medieval cosmology is surveyed in Chapter I. It is suggested that "it was Greek corruptions of Biblical Christianity which hampered the study of nature for fifteen hundred years." In the next two chapters the growth of science is traced from Bacon and Galileo to the "Billiard Ball Universe" of the nineteenth century. The collapse of this picture in modern physics is then explained (Ch. 4). This is followed by a clear but more technical discussion of the nature of scientific theory, symbolic logic and operationalism. An attempt is then made to show the inadequacy of the prevailing positivism. The author does not attempt to discuss in detail the conflict between religion and science. Her book ends, she says, where most writers on this subject begin. But she has shown that most discussions on this subject (from both sides) are still in terms of a philosophy of science now proved to be untenable. On the other hand, the possibility of faith is introduced through a hint of the validity of "creative imagination," to lift us out of the negative attitude of current positivism. A great deal of constructive thinking needs to be done on this before it can be presented as a Christian answer to positivism.

F. I. Andersen.

The Dialogues of Jesus. An arrangement of St. John's Gospel made by Claude Chavasse (Faber 8/6). The author has printed the text of the Gospel in dramatic form. "In the Gospel what is *done* is subordinate to what is *said*. . . . By arranging the text in dialogue form this has been made startlingly clear." It is difficult to deny the truth of the author's contention. The presentation is artistically attractive and strikingly effective. It is regrettable, however, that the order of the text should have been rearranged to suit subjective conclusions.

Walter Howard Frere. His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Constrution, ed. by R. C. D. Jasper (S.P.C.K., 35/-). The late Dr. Frere was an erudite liturgiologist and learned church historian who played a decisive part in the history of the Church of England during this century. His influence was immense and his scholarship was profound. This volume is a mine of information, not only on liturgical matters and Prayer Book revision, but also on the history of his times. His conclusions and contentions may be challenged: they cannot, however, be ignored. An important and impressive publication.

The New Testament: A (sic) Historical and Analytical Survey, by M. C. Tenney (I.V.F.). The most valuable part of this book is "Part 1: The World of the New Testament." The discussion on the political world, the social and economic world, and on the religious world is helpful. The analyses of individual books are satisfactory within their limits: although the necessity for compression has resulted in over-simplification. Nevertheless, as an introduction (despite Americanisms!) it is both serviceable and useful.

Guide to Christian Living, by Otto W. Heick (Muhlenberg $3). This is a popular study in Christian ethics. The author enunciates certain basic biblical truths which he then applies to the problems of life. The discussion ranges comprehensively from contraception to capital punishment, from euthanasia to freemasonry. The treatment is not profound, but it is helpful and honest. The author constantly appeals to the testimony of the Bible and quotes from the works of Luther. A useful study.

Books Reviews

Page

BEST, ERNEST: One Body in Christ 55
By the Rev. C. S. Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Vic.

BRUCE, F. F.: Commentary on the Book of Acts 56
By the Rev. D. W. B. Robinson, M.A., Moore College, Sydney.

FULLER, R. H.: The Mission and Achievement of Jesus .. 56
PREISS, THEO.: Life in Christ 56
By the Rev. Professor J. D. McCaughey, M.A., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.

HARDY, E. R.: (Ed.) Christology of the Later Fathers 57
By the Very Rev. Principal S. Barton Babbage, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Ridley College, Melbourne.

SHRENK, G.: Studien zu Paulus 58
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.

SIMPSON, E. K.: The Pastoral Epistles 59
By the Rev. Leon Morris, B.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., Vice-Principal, Ridley College, Melbourne.

WOODHOUSE, H. F.: The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603 60
By the Very Rev. Principal S. Barton Babbage.

SHORTER NOTICES 61

BOOKS RECEIVED (mention here neither precludes nor implies subsequent comment).

Inter-Varsity Fellowship: *Religious or Christian,* O. Hallesby, 6/-; *Law and Grace,* J. N. D. Anderson, 6d.

Muhlenberg: *The Catholicity of Protestantism,* ed. R. Newton Flew and R. E. Davies, $1.75; *Hinges of Destiny,* R. W. Loew, $2.75; *When Stones Hurt Your Feet,* K. H. A. Rest, $1.50.

S.C.M.: *The Faith that Rebels* (6th ed.), D. S. Cairns, 9/-; *The Numbered Days,* S. B. Jackman, 9/6; *Evanston Surveys,* W.C.C., 2/6 each; *Looking at Evanston,* H. G. G. Herklots, 3/6; *Evanston Speaks,* W.C.C., 2/6; *African Marriage,* T. Price, 2/6; *Temptation,* D. Bonhoeffer, 3/-.

S.P.C.K.: *Early Christianity,* B. S. Easton, 12/6; *After Thirty Years,* W. G. Peck, 1/; *Road to Renewal,* M. A. C. Warren, 1/6; *Problems of Marriage and Divorce,* Archbishop of Canterbury, 1/-; *Religious Education in Schools,* Institute of Christian Education, 8/6.

Tyndale: *The Finished Work of Christ,* A. M. Stibbs; *The Covenant of Grace,* John Murray; *Our Lord's View of the Old Testament,* J. W. Wenham; *The Centrality of the Messianic Idea for the Old Testament,* H. L. Ellison. Each 1/6.

W. D. Vaughan Print, 128 Denmark Street, Kew, E.4